

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am delighted that the majority leader has taken up the nomination of Judge James S. Gwin to be a U.S. district court judge for the northern district of Ohio.

Since 1989, Judge Gwin has served as a judge for the Court of Common Pleas in Stark County, OH. Three times during his judgeship, Judge Gwin has been elected administrative judge by his peers, and in 1995, he was elected presiding judge. In addition to his legal service, Judge Gwin has volunteered for several organizations, including the North Central Ohio Juvenile Diabetes Foundation and the Central Stark County Mental Health Center. His nomination enjoys the strong bipartisan support of Senator GLENN and Senator DEWINE.

Despite his exemplary record, one or more of my colleagues on the majority has again demanded a rollcall vote on a judicial nomination. That is, of course, the right of any Senator and I do not object. Indeed, I welcome the vote. I expect this rollcall vote to be much like the last eight in which a unanimous Senate approves a well-qualified judicial nomination. I congratulate Judge Gwin and his family on this achievement and look forward to his service on the U.S. district court.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the time will be charged equally. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of James S. Gwin, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Ohio? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 293 Ex.]

YEAS—100

Abraham	Burns	Dodd
Akaka	Byrd	Domenici
Allard	Campbell	Dorgan
Ashcroft	Chafee	Durbin
Baucus	Cleland	Enzi
Bennett	Coats	Faircloth
Biden	Cochran	Feingold
Bingaman	Collins	Feinstein
Bond	Conrad	Ford
Boxer	Coverdell	Frist
Breaux	Craig	Glenn
Brownback	D'Amato	Gorton
Bryan	Daschle	Graham
Bumpers	DeWine	Gramm

Grams	Landrieu	Rockefeller
Grassley	Lautenberg	Roth
Gregg	Leahy	Santorum
Hagel	Levin	Sarbanes
Harkin	Lieberman	Sessions
Hatch	Lott	Shelby
Helms	Lugar	Smith (NH)
Hollings	Mack	Smith (OR)
Hutchinson	McCain	Snowe
Hutchison	McConnell	Specter
Inhofe	Mikulski	Stevens
Inouye	Moseley-Braun	Thomas
Jeffords	Moynihan	Thompson
Johnson	Murkowski	Thurmond
Kempthorne	Murray	Torricelli
Kennedy	Nickles	Warner
Kerrey	Reed	Wellstone
Kerry	Reid	Wyden
Kohl	Robb	
Kyl	Roberts	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

#### RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT OF 1997—MOTION TO PROCEED

The Senate continued with the consideration of the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under unanimous consent, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, it is the role of national governments to establish the rules within which companies and countries trade. That is what trade agreements do. They set strict rules. If, for example, a country does not enforce respect for patents, trade sanctions can be invoked.

Mr. President, you can bet that U.S. companies get right in the face of our negotiators to make sure that the rules in these agreements which protect their interests are ironclad and will be strictly enforced. That is what companies do. You can be absolutely sure that U.S. companies would laugh in the face of negotiators if they were told that their concerns were legitimate but could be pursued just as seriously in less enforceable side agreements.

My point, Mr. President, is that it is fine to represent the interests of the companies. We should do so. But we are also elected to represent other people in our country, not just large multinational corporations. We are elected to represent the majority of people.

I say, Mr. President, that we should take a very strong interest not only in representing the majority of people in our country but also in representing a lot of people, ordinary citizens, wage earners, ordinary people in the countries we trade with. Because if they do not make enough money to demand the products that we produce, then we are not going to do well.

Mr. President, I think this fast-track agreement, which extends on to

NAFTA and GATT, is deeply skewed toward large corporate interests. That has been our recent experience with trade agreements. And I want to talk a little bit about what has happened with NAFTA.

NAFTA has been in operation for 3 years. And we heard a lot about what NAFTA was going to do for all of us. We have an opportunity now to look at the results with NAFTA. They include loss of jobs, suppression of wages, and the weakening of food, safety, and pollution laws.

Mr. President, if we repeat these mistakes, we are only going to condemn ourselves to replicate some of NAFTA's worst measurable consequences. Let me draw for colleagues from a respected Economic Policy Institute report. This report was issued in September of this year and titled "NAFTA and the States: Job Destruction is Widespread." EI's study concluded that "an exploding deficit in net exports with Mexico and Canada has eliminated 394,835 U.S. jobs since NAFTA took effect in 1994." The report argues that this job loss contributed significantly to a 4-percent decline in real median wages in the United States since 1993. Minnesota, according to this report, lost about 6,500 jobs due to the NAFTA-related trade deficit between 1993 and 1996, contributing to about a 3.8 percent drop in real median wages.

Mr. President, last month the Institute for Policy Studies and United for a Fair Economy published a study which tracked the performance and actions of a number of companies which belong to a major corporate coalition which is advocating passage of fast track. The study found that the 40 companies which are members of the America Leads on Trade coalition, from whom all of our offices have received pro-fast-track materials regularly, cut jobs in 89 U.S. plants under NAFTA. The study also documents that almost 13,000 workers who were laid off by members of this coalition, America Leads on Trade, qualified for NAFTA retraining assistance. And while jobs were being cut by these firms, these firms' profits soared and the salaries of their CEO's were significantly higher than those of executives in other leading firms.

Mr. President, again, looking at the record with NAFTA, according to Public Citizen in a report released in September of this year, U.S. food imports have skyrocketed while U.S. inspections of imported food have declined significantly. The report charges that "imports of Mexican crops documented by the U.S. Government to be at high risk of pesticide contamination have dramatically increased under NAFTA, while inspection has decreased."

Mr. President, our experience with NAFTA can't be dismissed. Jobs and wages in the United States have gone down. We have this paradox over the last 20 years of workers' productivity going up but real wages going down. Wages have gone down in Mexico, too,